Office Supreme Court, U. S.
NOV 28 1928
CLERK

NO. 99

In the Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1928

J. F. LAWRENCE ET AL.,
Appellants,

vs.

ST. LOUIS-SAN FRANCISCO
RAILWAY COMPANY,
Appellee.

STATEMENT AND BRIEF OF APPELLEE.

E. T. MILLER,
C. B. STUART,
M. K. CRUCE,
BEN FRANKLIN,
Attorneys for Appellee.

Uterback Typewriting Company, 310 Sieur Thompson Bldg. Oklahoma City W 4-91

INDEX

PAGE

Statement 1

Argument 10

Discussion of preliminary statements made by appellants in their brief:

The railway company is seeking relief against the State statute in question, but does all things required of it under the law 17

The act of the Legislature was never primarily designed to protect the health of employés and their families 20

The effect of the interlocutory injunction, and the question of jurisdiction 21

The trial court did not abuse its discretion in refusing jurisdiction 28

The effect of the order of the trial court refusing jurisdiction upon the attitude before the State Corporation Commission 40

I. The statute now under consideration is a reasonable law of domestic economy, in a district having local peculiarities, and interferes directly with no rule of commerce 49

II. The Oklahoma Statute now under consideration is constitutional and valid because it is an exercise of the police power, and this was apparent on the face of the statute 73

III. The Oklahoma statute is a denial of the guaranty of due and equal protection of the law under the

PAGE

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. 77

IV. The next attack which we make upon this statute is that the Legislature selected an arbitrary point of time, and from that arbitrary point of time changed the rules of evidence, and by reason of such arbitrary point of time so selected, made and declared a *prima facie* case against removal by the railway company..... 85

CITATIONS OF AUTHORITIES.

Arkansas Railroad Commission *et al.* v. C. R. I. & P. Ry. Co., 274 U. S. 597, 71 L. ed. 1224..... 34

Bound v. South Carolina Ry. Co., 55 Fed. 186..... 38

C. B. & Q. Ry. Co. v. Ill., 200 U. S. 561, 50 L. ed. 596..... 74
C. O. S. 1921, Section 3482-3483-3484-3485..... 3-5
C. O. S. 1921, Section 3482-3484..... 29
Crutcher v. Commonwealth of Kentucky, 141 U. S. 47, 35 L. ed. 649..... 53

Druggan v. Anderson, 269 U. S. 36-40, 70 L. ed. 151-153, 46 Sup. Ct. Rep. 14..... 34

Ex parte Young, 207 U. S. 123, 52 L. ed. 714..... 17

Foster-Fountain Packing Co. *et al.* v. E. J. Haydel..... 57

Green v. Louisville Ry. Co., 244 U. S. 499, 61 L. ed. 1280.. 18
Gould v. McFall, 12 Atl. 336, 4 Am. St. Rep. 606..... 39
Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Ry. v. Ellis, 165 U. S. 150, 41 L. ed. 666..... 81
Goltra v. Weeks, 271 U. S. 536, 70 L. ed. 1074.....40-41

PAGE

Hannibal & St. Joseph Ry. Co. v. Husen, 95 U. S. 465, 24 L. ed. 527 52
Hawes v. Georgia, 258 U. S. 1, 66 L. ed. 431 87
Hovey v. McDonald, 109 U. S. 150-161, 27 L. ed. 888-891, 3 Sup. Ct. Rep. 136 36-37

Ill. Central R. Co. v. People of Ill., 163 U. S. 142, 41 L. ed. 107 63
Interstate Commerce Commission v. Louisville & N. R. Co., 101 Fed. 146 36-38

James-Dickson Farm Mortgage Co. *et al.* v. Harry 86
Johnson v. St. Paul & D. R. Co., 43 Minn. 222 82

Knox County v. George W. Harshman, 132 U. S. 14, 33 L. ed. 249 36-38-39

Lawrence v. St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co., 274 U. S. 588 11-16-33
Louisville Gas & Electric Co. v. Coleman 85
Lawton v. Steele, 152 U. S. 133, 38 L. ed. 385 57-74
Lochner v. New York, 198 U. S. 45, 49 L. ed. 937 73

Merrimack River Savings Bank v. City of Clay Center *et al.*, 219 U. S. 527, 55 L. ed. 320 36
Michigan Public Utilities Commission *et al.* v. Duke, 266 U. S. 570, 69 L. ed. 445 56
Mississippi R. Commission v. Ill. Central R. Co., 203 U. S. 335, 51 L. ed. 209 60
Missouri, O. & G. Ry. Co. v. State, 53 Okla. 341, 156 Pac. 1155 93
McNeill v. Southern Ry. Co., 202 U. S. 542, 50 L. ed. 1142 54

People v. Mallan, 222 N. Y. 456, 119 N. E. 102 85

R. C. L., Vol. 6, Sections 227-228 71-72

Southern Ry. Co. v. King, 217 U. S. 524, 54 L. ed. 878 61
Soon Hing v. Crowley, 113 U. S. 703, 28 L. ed. 1145 78

PAGE

State of Iowa v. Garbroski, 111 Iowa 496, 56 L. R. A. 570 78
State v. Loomis, 115 Mo. 307..... 81
St. Louis-San Francisco Ry. Co. v. Public Service Commission of Missouri, 254 U. S. 535, 65 L. ed. 389..... 64
State *ex rel.* Holladay v. King, Sheriff, Indiana, 66 N. W. 82 38
State *ex rel.* Hogan *et al.* v. District Court of Thirteenth Judicial District, 25 Okla. 871, 108 Pac. 375..... 39
Society Anonyme Bu Filtre Chamberland Systeme Pasteur *et al* v. Blount, 51 Fed. 610..... 38
State v. Horton *et al.*, 97 N. W. 434..... 40
St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Sounthern Ry. Co. v. State, 31 Okla. 509, 122 Pac. 217..... 92

Texas & Pacific Ry. Co. v. Marshall, 136 U. S. 393, 34 L. ed. 385..... 88

Wharton v. Miller, 33 Okla. 771..... 92
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Kansas, 216 U. S. 1, 54 L. ed. 355..... 54